



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,553	09/08/2003	Frank Tsai	USP2213A-WPI	3275
30265	7590	12/28/2005	EXAMINER	
RAYMOND Y. CHAN 108 N. YNEZ AVE., SUITE 128 MONTEREY PARK, CA 91754			HAWK, NOAH CHANDLER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3637	
DATE MAILED: 12/28/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/658,553

Applicant(s)

TSAI, FRANK

Examiner

Noah C. Hawk

Art Unit

3637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 27-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 27-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 September 2003 and 08 November 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The substitute drawing sheet for Figure 2 filed 11/8/2005 has been reviewed by the examiner and is not acceptable for the following reasons: In Figure 2, it remains unclear what part of the device reference characters 10, 20, 30, 40, 41, and 111 are referring to. The proposed amendments to the drawings filed 11/8/05 have been reviewed but the objection to the drawings presented in the prior office action remains. Although the applicant has presented a description of the elements that the reference characters were referring to, the drawings themselves have not been changed to overcome the objections presented therein. Therefore, the drawings are objected to because: in Figure 1, it remains unclear what part of the device reference characters 2, 10, 20, 30, 40, 41, 42, 50, and 111 are referring to. In Figure 4, it is unclear what part of the device reference characters 10', 50', and 111' are referring to. The drawings are further objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: On page 5, lines 5, 6, 18, 20, 21, 23, 26 and 27; page 6, lines 1, 2, 5-6, 9, 11, 17, 18, 22 and 23-24, page 7 lines 25, 27, 29, and 30, page 8, lines 1 and 6 and page 9, lines 2 and 3-4, reference is made to "top panel 11" which remains missing and/or mislabeled as "111" in Figures 1 and 2. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate

Art Unit: 3637

prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The amendment to the specification filed 11/8/2005 has been reviewed by the examiner and accepted.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The listing of references in the specification remains an improper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate

paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear whether the applicant is claiming a foldable pivot leg assembly or a foldable pivot leg assembly in combination with a tabletop structure. The applicant's comments in item 3 of the remarks section of the response to the first office action are very clear that the tabletop structure is a limitation of the claim. Therefore, the applicant should amend the claims to set forth a combination. Until the applicant does so, the claims will be treated as a subcombination of the "foldable pivot leg assembly." Any reference to the tabletop structure or any of its components in the claims will not be given any patentable weight.

6. Claims 30-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In Claim 30, lines 5-8, the applicant discloses "a foldable pivot leg assembly comprising a pair of table supporting frames foldably and spacedly affixed to said tabletop, wherein each of said table supporting frames comprises a pair of table supporting frames for foldably and spacedly affixing to said

Art Unit: 3637

tabletop." The repetition of the phrase "table supporting frames" makes it unclear how these two elements are related and confusing to the reader of the claims. One or both elements must be renamed to provide a clearer understanding of the applicant's invention. For the purposes of examination, the phrase "a foldable pivot leg assembly comprising a pair of table supporting frames foldably and spacedly affixed to said tabletop, wherein each of said table supporting frames comprises a pair of table supporting frames for foldably and spacedly affixing to said tabletop, wherein each of said table supporting frames comprises:" will be treated as reading "a foldable pivot leg assembly comprising a pair of table supporting frames foldably and spacedly affixed to said tabletop, wherein each of said table supporting frames comprises:." In other words, the two elements named "table supporting frames" will be considered one and the same until the applicant amends the claims to clearly differentiate the table supporting frames.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

a. A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanford in US Patent 6112674 in view of Virtue et al. in US Patent 2278810 and Palmer in US Patent 4825781.

b. Regarding Claim 27, Stanford discloses a foldable pivot leg assembly comprising a pair of table supporting frames for foldably and spacedly affixing to a tabletop wherein each of said table supporting frames comprises a leg frame (18, 20) having an upper end portion (22) for pivotally mounting between two tabletop supports which are longitudinally supported under a top panel along two side edge portions thereof respectively, and a supporting means (24, 30, 100) which comprises a supporting arm (24, 30) and a folding frame (100) wherein the supporting arm has a lower retention portion (104) pivotally connecting to said folding frame and an upper supporting portion (28,34) for transversely and pivotally mounting at a tabletop support in a detachably attaching manner (insofar as the applicant shows the supporting arm mounting in a detachably attaching manner), such that said retention portion of said supporting arm pivotally connects to said folding frame (best seen in Stanford, Figure 1) wherein said folding frame has two ends pivotally connected with said retention portions of said supporting arms (see Stanford, column 7, lines 27-31) and said leg frame (see Stanford, column 7, lines 20-24) respectively in such a manner that in a folded position, said leg frames are pivotally and inwardly folded for resting under said top panel, and in an unfolded position, said leg frames are firmly and rigidly supported by said supporting means and pivotally and outwardly unfolded for perpendicularly standing under a top panel. Stanford does not disclose that the supporting frame has two supporting arms or that they are L-shaped. Virtue et al. disclose a supporting frame with two supporting arms (32), but do not disclose

that the arms have an L-shape. Palmer discloses a supporting frame (A) with two L-shaped arms (formed by the portions 3 and 4 of frame A). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the device of Stanford by adding two supporting arms as taught by Virtue et al. in order to provide a more stable support structure for a tabletop and by adding a supporting frame with two L-shaped arms as taught by Palmer in order to provide more structural rigidity to a tabletop.

c. Regarding Claim 28, Stanford further teaches that the folding frame comprises two folding arms (100) pivotally connected to the leg frames (see Stanford, column 7, lines 20-24) and connected by a pivot joint (see Stanford, column 7, lines 27-31) to end portions of the supporting arms with the end portions of the supporting arms sandwiched between the end portions of the folding arms (best seen in Stanford, Figure 3).

d. Regarding Claim 29, Stanford further teaches that each supporting means further comprises a ring-shaped locker (108) slidably mounted to the supporting arm.

9. Claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanford in US Patent 6112674 in view of Virtue et al. in US Patent 2278810 and Palmer in US Patent 4825781.

e. Regarding Claim 30, Stanford discloses table comprising a plastic made (see Stanford, column 12, line 53-54) top panel (12) with two tabletop supports (42,44) longitudinally supported under the top panel along two side edge portions

thereof, a foldable pivot leg assembly comprising a pair of table supporting frames foldably and spacedly affixed to the tabletop wherein each of said table supporting frames comprises a leg frame (18, 20) having an upper end portion (22) for pivotally mounting between the two tabletop supports which are longitudinally supported under the top panel along two side edge portions thereof respectively, and a supporting means (24, 30, 100) which comprises a supporting arm (24, 30) and a folding frame (100) wherein the supporting arm has a lower retention portion (104) pivotally connecting to said folding frame and an upper supporting portion (28,34) for transversely and pivotally mounting at the tabletop support in a detachably attaching manner (insofar as the applicant shows the supporting arm mounting in a detachably attaching manner), such that said retention portion of said supporting arm pivotally connects to said folding frame (best seen in Stanford, Figure 1) wherein said folding frame has two ends pivotally connected with said retention portions of said supporting arms (see Stanford, column 7, lines 27-31) and said leg frame (see Stanford, column 7, lines 20-24) respectively in such a manner that in a folded position, said leg frames are pivotally and inwardly folded for resting under said top panel, and in an unfolded position, said leg frames are firmly and rigidly supported by said supporting means and pivotally and outwardly unfolded for perpendicularly standing under said top panel. Stanford does not disclose that the supporting frame has two supporting arms or that they are L-shaped. Virtue et al. disclose a supporting frame with two supporting arms (32), but do not disclose that the arms

have an L-shape. Palmer discloses a supporting frame (A) with two L-shaped arms (formed by the portions 3 and 4 of frame A) having parallel portions. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the device of Stanford by adding two supporting arms as taught by Virtue et al. in order to provide a more stable support structure for a tabletop and by adding a supporting frame with two L-shaped arms as taught by Palmer in order to provide more structural rigidity to a tabletop.

f. Regarding Claim 31, Stanford further teaches that the folding frame comprises two folding arms (100) pivotally connected to the leg frames (see Stanford, column 7, lines 20-24) and connected by a pivot joint (see Stanford, column 7, lines 27-31) to end portions of the supporting arms with the end portions of the supporting arms sandwiched between the end portions of the folding arms (best seen in Stanford, Figure 3).

g. Regarding Claim 32, Stanford further teaches that each supporting means further comprises a ring-shaped locker (108) slidably mounted to the supporting arm.

10. Claims 33, 34, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanford in view of Virtue et al. and Palmer as applied to claims 30 and 32 above, and further in view of Pinch in US Patent 6058853.

h. Regarding Claim 33, as stated above, Stanford in view of Virtue et al. and Palmer teaches all of the limitations of Claim 30 including a table with supporting frames, but does not teach a surrounding rim with an inner and outer sidewall

depending from the tabletop. Pinch teaches a surrounding rim downwardly extended from said edge portion thereof, wherein said surrounding rim has an outer sidewall (176) and an inner sidewall (152) to define a receiving track longitudinally formed under said top panel along said respective side edge portion thereof wherein tabletop supports are securely mounted within said receiving tracks. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the device of Stanford in view of Virtue et al. and Palmer by adding a receiving track with inner and outer sidewalls as taught by Pinch in order to provide a more secure mounting means for the tabletop supports.

i. Regarding Claim 34, as stated above, Stanford in view of Virtue et al. and Palmer teaches all of the limitations of Claim 32 including a table with supporting frames, but does not teach a surrounding rim with an inner and outer sidewall depending from the tabletop. Pinch teaches a surrounding rim downwardly extended from said edge portion thereof, wherein said surrounding rim has an outer sidewall (176) and an inner sidewall (152) to define a receiving track longitudinally formed under said top panel along said respective side edge portion thereof wherein tabletop supports are securely mounted within said receiving tracks. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the device of Stanford in view of Virtue et al. and Palmer by adding a receiving track with inner and outer sidewalls as taught by

Pinch in order to provide a more secure mounting means for the tabletop supports.

j. Regarding Claim 39, as stated above, Stanford in view of Virtue et al, Palmer and Pinch teaches all of the limitations of Claim 33 including a table with supporting frames. Stanford further discloses holes in the tabletop supports (ref.46 and column 14, lines 5-7) to receive the ends of the leg frames in the supporting members, but does not disclose a specific number. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to choose an appropriate number of holes in the tabletop supports to accommodate all of the arms of the table supporting frames.

k. Regarding Claim 40, as stated above, Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer and Pinch teaches all of the limitations of Claim 34 including a table with supporting frames. Stanford further discloses holes in the tabletop supports (ref.46 and column 14, lines 5-7) to receive the ends of the leg frames in the supporting members, but does not disclose a specific number. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to choose an appropriate number of holes in the tabletop supports to accommodate all of the arms of the table supporting frames.

l. Regarding Claim 41, as stated above Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer and Pinch teaches all of the limitations of Claim 39 including a table with supporting frames. Pinch further teaches a plurality of guiding slots (160) formed on the inner sidewall of the surrounding rim to align with an attachment

arrangement. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the device of Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer and Pinch by using guiding slots as taught by Pinch in order to provide a means to more positively align the arms of the supporting frames with the holes in the tabletop supports.

m. Regarding Claim 42, as stated above Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer and Pinch teaches all of the limitations of Claim 40 including a table with supporting frames. Pinch further teaches a plurality of guiding slots (160) formed on the inner sidewall of the surrounding rim to align with an attachment arrangement. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the device of Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer and Pinch by using guiding slots as taught by Pinch in order to provide a means to more positively align the arms of the supporting frames with the holes in the tabletop supports.

n. Regarding Claim 43, as stated above, Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer and Pinch teaches all of the limitations of Claim 34 including a table with supporting frames but does not disclose a folding table. Pinch further discloses a tabletop comprising a folding joint (164) formed at a mid-portion of the tabletop so that the two halves of the tabletop are rotatably mounted with each other. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the device of Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer and Pinch by

using a foldable tabletop as taught by Pinch in order to make stowage of the table easier when not in use.

o. Regarding Claim 45, as stated above, Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer and Pinch teaches all of the limitations of Claim 42 including a table with supporting frames but does not disclose a folding table. Pinch further discloses a tabletop comprising a folding joint (164) formed at a mid-portion of the tabletop so that the two halves of the tabletop are rotatably mounted with each other. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the device of Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer and Pinch by using a foldable tabletop as taught by Pinch in order to make stowage of the table easier when not in use.

11. Claims 35-38 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanford in view of Virtue et al, Palmer and Pinch and further in view of Witkowiak in US Patent 2695828.

p. Regarding Claim 35, as stated above, Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer and Pinch teaches all of the limitations of Claim 33 including a table with supporting frames but does not disclose an attachment arrangement comprising attachment members and mounting members. Witkowiak discloses mounting foldable leg frames to a supporting siderail using attachment members (16) extending from the siderail that are inserted into the leg frames (see Witkowiak, fig. 2), but does not disclose four attachment members and four coupling members. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of invention to modify the device of Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer and Pinch, to use an attachment arrangement of members extending from the siderail to be inserted into the frame segments as taught by Witkowiak, and in an appropriate number to accommodate all of the frame segments that needed to be attached in order to provide a more secure mounting means for the support members.

q. Regarding Claim 36, as stated above, Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer and Pinch teaches all of the limitations of Claim 34 including a table with supporting frames but does not disclose an attachment arrangement comprising attachment members and mounting members. Witkowiak discloses mounting foldable leg frames to a supporting siderail using attachment members (16) extending from the siderail that are inserted into the leg frames (see Witkowiak, fig. 2), but does not disclose four attachment members and four coupling members. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the device of Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer and Pinch, to use an attachment arrangement of members extending from the siderail to be inserted into the frame segments as taught by Witkowiak, and in an appropriate number to accommodate all of the frame segments that needed to be attached in order to provide a more secure mounting means for the support members.

r. Regarding Claim 37, as stated above, Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer, Pinch and Witkowiak teaches all of the limitations of Claim 35 including a

table with supporting frames but does not disclose guiding slots. Pinch further teaches a plurality of guiding slots (160) formed on the inner sidewall of the surrounding rim to align with an attachment arrangement. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the device of Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer, Pinch and Witkowiak by using guiding slots as taught by Pinch in order to provide a means to more positively align the arms of the supporting frames with the holes in the tabletop supports.

s. Regarding Claim 38, as stated above, Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer, Pinch and Witkowiak teaches all of the limitations of Claim 36 including a table with supporting frames but does not disclose guiding slots. Pinch further teaches a plurality of guiding slots (160) formed on the inner sidewall of the surrounding rim to align with an attachment arrangement. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the device of Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer, Pinch and Witkowiak by using guiding slots as taught by Pinch in order to provide a means to more positively align the arms of the supporting frames with the holes in the tabletop supports.

t. Regarding Claim 44, as stated above, Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer, Pinch and Witkowiak teaches all of the limitations of Claim 38 including a table with supporting frames but does not disclose a folding table. Pinch further discloses a tabletop comprising a folding joint (164) formed at a mid-portion of the tabletop so that the two halves of the tabletop are rotatably mounted with each other. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of invention to modify the device of Stanford in view of Virtue et al., Palmer, Pinch and Witkowiak by using a foldable tabletop as taught by Pinch in order to make stowage of the table easier when not in use.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 11/8/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

13. In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "for a banquet table with a tabletop which comprises a plastic made tabletop panel and two tabletop supports" in Claim 1 has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

14. Applicant's remarks regarding the rejections based on Fanuzzi are moot, as the Fanuzzi reference is not used in this action.

15. The applicant's enumeration of the elements lacked by Stanford is moot as these elements are addressed in the modifying references.

Art Unit: 3637

16. Regarding applicant's arguments in items 17 and 18, Virtue et al. teach the use of two supporting arms in a folding assembly, connected to a tabletop support (34). Palmer teaches the concept of using an L-shaped (formed by the portions 3 and 4 of frame A) support, motivated by the need for more leg space under the table and a more stable structural support at the table.
17. Regarding applicant's argument that Pinch does not disclose a receiving track as claimed or a suggestion of how to embed the support therein, the Pinch reference teaches the structural elements as claimed. The applicant also fails to suggest embedding the support in the rim in the claim, so that feature is irrelevant.
18. Applicant's argument item 20 is not understandable.
19. Regarding applicant's argument item 21, Pinch teaches the structural elements of the connection structure of the application.
20. Regarding applicant's argument regarding the Witkowiak reference, the applicant is directed to Witkowiak, Figure 2, where the engagement of the supporting arm with the pivot pin is clearly shown.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 3637

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Noah C. Hawk whose telephone number is 571-272-1480. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on 571-272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NCH
NCH
12/16/05

LANNA MAI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Lanna Mai